

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 24, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,303,327 ("Sturner") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,181 ("Junqua"). Claim 13 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 13 is moot.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 16, and 17 to clarify that a subject score is based on a combination of task item scores using a scoring computation model that depends upon an expected task item-dependent operating characteristic of the speech recognition system. The scoring computation model may weigh a response to a task item differently based on the speech recognition system's ability to detect a correct response to a particular task item. For example, if it is expected that the speech recognition system will have difficulty detecting the correct response to task item 5, then the scoring computation model may be changed to reduce the weight assigned to a response to task item 5. Thus the scoring computation model, not the speech recognition system, accounts for the speech recognition system's expected task item-dependent operating characteristics. Further, the scoring computation model is based upon an expected task item-dependent operating characteristic of the speech recognition system, and not upon a response from any particular subject.

Applicant believes that neither Sturner nor Junqua show or suggest a scoring computation model that depends upon an expected task item-dependent operating characteristic of the speech recognition system. The Office Action states and Applicant agrees that Sturner does not teach that the subject score accounts for the item-dependent operational characteristics of the speech recognition system. (See, Office Action, page 3-4.) Applicant also believes that Junqua does not teach a scoring computation model that depends upon an expected task item-dependent operating

characteristic of the speech recognition system.

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Junqua describes changing the speech recognition system based on a particular response. More specifically, Junqua describes a system for adapting an initial speech model to that of the user by basing its adaptation on utterances recognized with a high confidence. (See, e.g., Junqua, column 1, lines 9-17.) Accordingly, Junqua teaches a response-dependent adaptation of the speech recognition system. The combination of Sturner and Junqua would not result in a system in which a scoring computation model is changed based upon an expected task item-dependent operating characteristic of the speech recognition system. Because neither Sturner nor Junqua show or suggest a scoring computation model that depends upon an expected task item-dependent operating characteristic of the speech recognition system, Applicant submits that claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 16, and 17 are not obvious in light of the combination of Sturner and Junqua.

Claims 2-6 depend on claim 1. Claims 10-12 depend on claim 8. Claim 15 depends on claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant also submits that claims 2-6, 10-12, and 15 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's representative below if any questions arise or she may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2004

By:



Lisa M. Schoedel

Reg. No. 53,564

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

300 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6709

312 935 2362

schoedel@mbhb.com